DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 098 774 88 EC 070 537

TITLE	Zoo Project for Handicapped Children: Language Development Through Animal Utilization. Final Project Report.
INSTITUTION	California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Bureau of Program Planning and Development.; San Diego Unified School District, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	21 Jun 73
NOTE	52p.; For related documents, see EC 070 536-538
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Demonstration Projects; Educational Facilities; Exceptional Child Education; *Information Dissemination; *Language Arts; *Learning Disabilities; *Mentally Handicapped; Program Evaluation; Recreational Facilities; *Zoos
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title III; ESEA Title III

ABSTRACT

The report examines the 1972-73 dissemination program of San Diego's Zoo Project for Handicapped Children which was designed to stimulate language arts improvement in mentally or educationally handicapped students by using animals at the zoo site and in schools. The following program objectives are identified: to encourage and the adoption/adaptation of the zoo project in a minimum of 10 other California districts or schools; to create an awareness about the project among 100 school districts in the state; to operate a model demonstration program; to conduct staff training seminars; to provide technical assistance for implementation; and to evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness. The report contains statistical data on such program features as staff development and project products; and a program narrative report which focuses on such elements as needs assessment procedures, personnel and organizational details, instructional equipment and materials, budget, and evaluation findings. The evaluation is said to show that project activities included 18 teacher training workshops for 552 people and visits from 185 people to the model demonstration program. (GW)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
(Language Development Through Animal Utilization)

No. 37-68338-1193-0

San Diego Unified School District

June 21, 1973

Final Year Dissemination Project

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Component I - Statistical Data	1
Component II - Data for United States Office of Education	
Cover Page	4
Part I - Staff Development	5
Part II - Extent of Adoption/Adaption	5
Title III - Areas of Influence	7
Part III - Extent of Participation	8
Part IV - Staff Participation/Higher Education Cooperation	12
Part V - Abstract	15
Part VI - Products of Project	16
Component III - Program Narrative Report	
Context	
The Locale	17
The School System	18
Needs Assessment	19
Historical Background	20
Program	
Scope of the Program	21
Personnel	22
Organizational Details	23
Activities or Services	24
Instructional Equipment and Materials	26
Parent Community Involvement	27
Budget	28
Special Factors	29
Dissemination	30
Evaluation	
Summary of Zoo Project Objectives and Findings 1972-73	34
1972-73 Adoption/Adaption Activities	35
Continuation and Expansion of the Local Program	36
Adapters Other Than Schools or School Districts	37
School Districts Outside California	38
Adapters Other Than Schools or School Districts Outside California	38
Component IV - Financial Report	
Expenditure Report) Inventory of Equipment) Project Phases and Per Pupil Costs) Claim for Reimbursement)	To be submitted within 90 days
Appendix A - Addresses of Contact Persons	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE BEST COPY AVAILABLE

California State Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, California 95814

Bureau of
Instructional
Program Planning
and Development

ESEA TITLE III STATISTICAL DATA
Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965
(P.L. 89-10 as amended by P.L. 90-247)

THIS SPACE FOR STATE USE ONLY →	County	District Code	Project #	Type	

SECTION A - PROJECT INFORMATION

1. REASON FOR SUBMISSION OF THIS FORM (Check one)
- A [ ] INITIAL APPLICATION FOR TITLE III GRANT OR RESUBMISSION
- B [ ] APPLICATION FOR CONTINUATION GRANT
- C [X] Project Report

2. IN ALL CASES EXCEPT INITIAL APPLICATION, GIVE ASSIGNED PROJECT NUMBER: 37-68338-1193-0

3. MAJOR DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT (Check one only)
- A [X] INNOVATIVE
- B [ ] EXEMPLARY
- C [ ] ADAPTIVE

4. TYPE(S) OF ACTIVITY (Check one or more)
- A [ ] PLANNING OF PROGRAM
- B [ ] PLANNING OF CONSTRUCTION
- C [ ] CONDUCTING PILOT ACTIVITIES
- D [X] OPERATION OF PROGRAM
- E [ ] CONSTRUCTING
- F [ ] REMODELING

5. PROJECT TITLE (5 Words or Less)

ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION)

6. BRIEFLY SUMMARIZE THE PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND GIVE THE ITEM NUMBER OF THE AREA OF MAJOR EMPHASIS AS LISTED IN SEC. 303, P.L. 89-10. (See instructions)

To encourage and promote the adoption or adaption of the ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school settings (District or schools) in the State of California.

ITEM NUMBER _____

7. NAME OF APPLICANT (Local Education Agency)	8. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code)
San Diego Unified School District	4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103

9. NAME OF COUNTY	10. CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT
San Diego	35, 36, 37

11. NAME OF PROJECT DIRECTOR	12. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)
Gerald F. Lamb	4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103	234-6194 AREA CODE 714

13. Name of Authorized Agent	14. ADDRESS (Number, Street, City, State, Zip Code) (Bus.)	PHONE NUMBER (Bus.)
Howard Crofts	4100 Normal Street San Diego, California 92103	298-4681 AREA CODE 714

15. POSITION OR TITLE
Deputy Superintendent for Administration

Signature of Authorized Agent	DATE SUBMITTED
H. Crofts	

Page 2 on back

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION A – Continued

16. LIST THE NUMBER OF EACH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT SERVED	17A. TOTAL NUMBER OF COUNTIES SERVED	18. LATEST AVERAGE PER PUPIL AD? EXPENDITURE OF LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES SERVED
35, 36, 37	1	$ 897.33 (1971-72)
	B. TOTAL NUMBER OF LEA'S SERVED: 5	
	C. TOTAL ESTIMATED POPULATION IN GEOGRAPHIC AREA SERVED: City of San Diego 730,000	

SECTION B – TITLE III BUDGET SUMMARY FOR PROJECT (Include amount from item 2c below)

1.		PREVIOUS OE GRANT NUMBER	BEGINNING DATE (Month, Year)	ENDING DATE (Month, Year)	FUNDS REQUESTED
A.	Initial Application or Resubmission				$
B.	Application for First Continuation Grant				$
C.	Application for Second Continuation Grant				$
D.	Total Title III Funds				$
E.	End of Budget Period Report				

2. *Complete the following items only if this project includes construction, acquisition, remodeling, or leasing of facilities for which Title III funds are requested. Leave blank if not appropriate.*

A. *Type of function (Check applicable boxes)*

1 ☐ REMODELING OF FACILITIES 2 ☐ LEASING OF FACILITIES 3 ☐ ACQUISITION OF FACILITIES

4 ☐ CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES 5 ☐ ACQUISITION OF BUILT-IN EQUIPMENT

N/A

B. 1. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE PROPOSED FACILITY	2. TOTAL SQUARE FEET IN THE FACILITY TO BE USED FOR TITLE III PROGRAMS	C. AMOUNT OF TITLE III FUNDS REQUESTED FOR FACILITY
N/A	N/A	$ N/A

Enter Project No. 37-68338-1193-0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SECTION C - PROJECT CLASSIFICATION

1. Project Subjects

- 1.1 [X] - Language Arts (Development)
- 1.2 [ ] - Fine Arts
- 1.3 [ ] - Foreign Language
- 1.4 [ ] - Mathematics
- 1.5 [ ] - Science
- 1.6 [ ] - Social Science, Humanities
- 1.7 [ ] - P.E., Recreation, and Health
- 1.8 [ ] - Vocational Education
- 1.9 [ ] - Other

2. Handicapped Education

- 2.1 [X] - Mentally Retarded
- 2.2 [ ] - Hard of Hearing
- 2.3 [ ] - Deaf
- 2.4 [ ] - Speech Impaired
- 2.5 [ ] - Visually Handicapped
- 2.6 [X] - Seriously Emotionally Disturbed
- 2.7 [ ] - Crippled
- 2.8 [ ] - Other Health Impaired

3. Guidance, Counseling, and Testing

- 3.1 [ ] - Counseling with Handicapped
- 3.2 [ ] - Group Guidance Activities
- 3.3 [ ] - Group Counseling
- 3.4 [ ] - Career Guidance and Counseling
- 3.5 [ ] - Counseling with Special Problems
- 3.6 [ ] - Use of Paraprofessionals
- 3.7 [ ] - Parent Conferences
- 3.8 [ ] - Follow-up and Drop-out Studies
- 3.9 [ ] - Inservice Training
- 3.10 [ ] - Use of Community Resources
- 3.11 [ ] - Curriculum Development
- 3.12 [ ] - General Counseling
- 3.13 [ ] - Consultation with Teachers
- 3.14 [ ] - Program Evaluation and Development

4. Grade Levels

- 4.1 [X] - Preschool (indicate ages 3 or 4) _____
- 4.2 [X] - Elementary (indicate grades K-6) _____
- 4.3 [X] - Secondary (indicate grades 7-12) _____
- 4.4 [ ] - Junior College (indicate grades 13-14) _____
- 4.5 [X] - Adult

5. Is your project an adoption or adaptation of another Title III project? [ ] Yes [X] No

If yes, name the agency operating the project: _____

_____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COVER PAGE

for Component II

Data for U. S. Office of Education

(To be completed for all projects active for any period between July 1972 - Through June 30, 1973. Agencies having more than one project must prepare a report for each project.)

Enter information for items 1 through 7.

1. 37-68338-1193-0

2. ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN
Project Title

3. San Diego Unified School District
Local Educational Agency
4100 Normal Street
San Diego, California 92103

4. Dr. David Fish
Name of school official responsible for this report
(714) 298-4681 Ext. 516
Phone No.

5. Gerald F. Lamb
Name of Project Director
(714) 234-6194
Phone No.

6. The 1972-73 school year has been .....

6.1 [XX] The first year of operation.

6.2 [ ] The second year of operation.

6.3 [ ] The third year of operation.

7. Enter the following ending dates:

Ending date for first year: June 30, 1973 - Extended to July 26, 1973

Ending date for second year: _____

Ending date for third and final year: _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART I - STAFF DEVELOPMENT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The report should describe project staff development activities that took place during the period July 1, 1972, through June 30, 1973. If no project staff development activities occurred, write NONE in the first column. Staff development activities are those inservice efforts designed to improve competencies of the staff working full or part-time on the project. Enter the figures in columns two and three.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES OF ONE OR MORE DAYS DURATION 1972-73					
(1)	(2)	(3) No. of workshops, conferences and seminars held by type of training			
Definition of Staff: (Staff includes all personnel assigned to work on the project full or part time, whether paid by the district or the project.)	Total No. of participants (Unduplicated) in all activities.	Dissemination to spread information about project	Evaluation to appraise progress	Combination of dissemination & evaluation	Other, such as in-service education. Specify (Use back of this page.)
Staff of 3 →	78 Direct 3027 Indirect	37			2 direct 16 indirect 12 demonstrations

PART II - EXTENT OF ADOPTION/ADAPTION

1972-1973

The purpose of this section is to find out how many projects are being continued to some extent by the grantee or by other school districts after federal funds have expired.

The report should be limited to projects for which federal funds expired during the period July 1, 1972 through June 30, 1973. If the grantee district expects to continue the project to some extent during the next fiscal year, this should be reported by marking the box. The estimated extent of adoption or adaption by the grantee district should be shown by circling the appropriate percentage figure in the scale.

1. The project is being continued by the grantee in some form after federal funds expired. [X] Yes [ ] No

2. If the answer is YES, draw a circle around the one figure which best represents your estimate of the degree of adoption/adaption of the project in your school district.

20% 30% 40% 50% 60% (70%) 80% 90% 100%

PART II - Continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Is the project being adopted or adapted by other school districts?

[X] Yes [ ] No

4. If the answer is YES, list the school districts by name and address:

4.1 Alhambra City Schools
2121 West Main Street
Alhambra, California 91801

4.2 Arcadia Unified Schools District
234 Campus Drive
Arcadia, California 91006

4.3 Burlingame School District
1560 Newlands
Burlingame, California

4.4 Chino Unified School District
5130 Riverside
Chino, California 91710

4.5 Chula Vista City School District
84 East J Street - P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista, California 92012

4.6 Garden Grove Unified School Dist
10331 Stanford Avenue
Garden Grove, California 92640

4.7 Los Angeles School District

Los Angeles, Calif 90007

4.8 Ocean View School District
7972 Warner Avenue
Huntington Beach, California 92647

4.9 Riverside County Schools
P.O.Box 868
Riverside, California 92502

4.10 Little Lake School District
9400 Jersey Avenue
Santa Fe Springs, Calif 90670

4.11 Santee School District

Santee, California

4.12 Victor School District
16821 "A" Street
Victorville, California 92392

4.13 Montessori Academy-Mt. Helix

Spring Valley, California

4.14

4.15

4.16

4.17

4.18

4.19

4.20

In addition: 27 teachers who participated in a workshop sponsored by LaVerne College responded indicating individual application of the Zoo Project approach using our materials. Other agencies have requested Zoo Project Materials and activities for use in their programs. These have included the San Francisco Zoo; the Taronga Zoo, Sydney, Australia; the Bronx Zoo; Mohawk Park Zoo, Tulsa, Oklahoma; Larue D. Carter Memorial Hospital, Indianapolis, Indiana.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART II (Continued)

Title III Areas of Influence*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

As Project Director and/or after consultation with district or county personnel involved:

1. Name Gerald Lamb Title Project Director
2. Name _____ Title _____
3. Name _____ Title _____

Please rank the impact of this ESEA, Title III project on your local educational agency (LEA). Leave blank any items that do not apply and add other categories as desired. Rank items 1 to 7 (or more if you have made additions to the list). Give examples only on items ranked 1 and 2. Number 1 indicates that throughout the LEA the impact was greatest in developing skill areas or additudinal changes in:

Rank**		Examples
_____	Special project development Needs assessment, goal setting, planning (writing), implementation, etc.	Use this space to give examples of items ranked 1 and 2. 1. Confidence and skill in handling appropriate classroom animals and using them to motivate work in the regular curriculum. 2. High use of project materials and approaches. Frequent requests from all over the state for additional copies of the handbook. 3. Excellent example of a school district and a local community agency working together to meet a known educational need.
1	Staff training Resulting in added skills or attitudinal change	
_____	Parental involvement in the schools Bringing parents into more direct contact with school activities	
3	Community involvement Instances of community participation other than parents	
_____	Evaluation competencies and use of evaluation information	
2	Products developed Have the products developed by the project, i.e., Materials: curriculum guides, AV materials, etc. Methods: individualized instructions, use of aides, etc.: been put to use beyond project requirement? List under examples.	
_____	Management and accounting procedures Have the project activities resulted in increased accountability in other learning situations? List under examples.	
_____	Other - Please explain	

* As a result of participation in ESEA, Title III endeavors

** Information derived will indicate areas of greatest impact - Number 1 most impact Number 7 (or more) least impact.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III - EXTENT OF PARTICIPATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1972-1973

The purpose of this part of the report is to find out the actual direct or indirect participation of public and private school pupils and adults in the project during the 1972-73 operational period.

Any participation should be reported only once. The count should be based on actual participation during the 1972-73 school year. The numbers are almost certain to be different from those anticipated in the project application.

The United States Office of Education definitions should be applied:

Direct Participation - Enter the number of different persons participating in activities involving face-to-face interaction of pupils and teachers designed to produce learning, in a classroom, a center or mobile unit; or receiving other special services.

Indirect Participation - Enter the number of different persons visiting or viewing exhibits, demonstrations, museum displays; using materials or equipment developed or purchased by the project; attending performances of plays, symphonies, etc.; viewing television instruction in a school, a center, or home; or participating in other similar activities. Carefully prepared estimates are acceptable.

Elementary - For reporting purposes only, consider elementary as being Prekindergarten through Grade 6.

Secondary - For reporting purposes only, consider secondary as being Grades 7 through 12.

Please supply the information requested for the project.

Table A

Number of Public and Nonpublic School Teachers, and Counselors Participating

Schools (a)	Staff whose students were direct participants				Staff whose students were indirect participants			
	Teachers		Counselors		Teachers		Counselors	
	Elementary (b)	Secondary (c)	Elementary (d)	Secondary (e)	Elementary (f)	Secondary (g)	Elementary (h)	Secondary (i)
Public	71				2,335	13		
Nonpublic	5				25	5		

PART III (Continued) BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The totals in the following 4 tables must agree one with the other. Also, do not use duplicated figures in the first 4 tables. The target population must be represented by the figures when direct participants are reported. See definitions for direct and indirect in Part III.

Table I

a. Program Select the program of your project. Use "other" category if none apply.	b. Check (✓) program area(s) covered	c. No. of public school students directly participating	d. Amount granted this past year
Reading			
Environment/Ecology			
Equal Educational Opportunity			
Model Cities (Urban, Inner-City)			
Gifted			
Handicapped	X	1,045	$ 38,500
Guidance and Counseling			
Drug Education			
Early Childhood Education (Kindergarten and below)			
Other Programs			
	Total	1,045	

Table II

Provide unduplicated counts of students by grade levels. See instructions below:

	a. School Enrollment		b. Direct Project Participants		c. Indirect Project Participants		d.	e.
	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic	Public	Nonpublic		
Pre K		*						
K	8,689							
1	9,117							
2	9,441							
3	9,948							
4	10,126							
5	9,946							
6	10,081							
7	10,007							
8	9,584							
9	9,409							
10	9,688							
11	8,855							
12	7,772							
Ungraded	3,056							
TOTALS	125,719*		944	101			1,576	1,635*

Ungraded Special Education Classes - Total 1,045 Direct student participants

Unknown

Information not reported to us

* includes LEA San Diego Unified only

Column a. Include the total enrollment in the local educational agency.

Column b. Include only the target population.

Column b. & c. See definitions of direct and indirect for both columns.

Column d. Include an estimate of the number of target population students who have been in the project since its inception. A cumulative total of all years is requested. Provide an unduplicated count; therefore, do not count any student more than once.

Column e. Include an estimate of the number of students within the local educational agency who have not been directly serviced by the project, but would benefit from direct participation because they fit the description of the target population.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE PART III (Continued) BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table III

Rural/Urban Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants Served by Project - Enter Number of Each Category. See definitions at bottom of page.

Rural		Metropolitan			Total of all Categories
Farm	Non Farm	Low Socio-Economic	Other	Other Urban	
0	19	117	777	132	1,045

Table IV

Distribution of Public School, Direct Participants by Project - Enter Number of Each Group.

Negro	American Indian	Spanish Surname	Oriental	White	Other Nonwhite	Total of all groups
189	4	213	13	626		1,045

Recap of Totals for Tables I, II, III and IV.

Total of Column c., Table I	1,045
Total of Column b. (Public School), Table II	944
Total of All Categories, Table III	1,045
Total of All Groups, Table IV	1,045

+ 101 non public = 1,045

The totals on each line above should agree one with the other.

Definitions:

Rural means an outlying area of less than 2,500 inhabitants.
Low socio-economic means an area of low socio-economic level within a city of 50,000 inhabitants or more.
Other means areas in cities of 50,000 or more inhabitants which are other than low socio-economic areas.
Other Urban means areas (including suburbs) with less than 50,000 but more than 2,500 inhabitants.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table V

Provide Number of Schools in the Project.

Direct particpation

	Public	Nonpublic
Elementary	50	5
Secondary	2	

Table C

Number of Students Served Directly by Unique Target Populations (Figures may be duplicated

Students	Indians	Migrants	Disadvantaged	Handicapped	Childhood Education (Kgtn.& Below)	Other Target Populations (See note below)
	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
Number of Students				10		1,035

Note for Column (g) check populations included in the number entered above.

_____ Children from non-English speaking environment.

_____ Neglected and delinquent children.

_____ Gifted 7 N.H. 299 EMR _____ Dropouts

_____ Other (specify) 112 TMR, 598 E.H., Gifted E.H. 10, 9 Visually Handicapped

BEST COPY AVAILABLE BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART IV - STAFF PARTICIPATION/HIGHER EDUCATION COOPERATION

Table VII

Complete the table below as directed. Compute full time equivalent (F.T.E.) according to the instructions under the table.

Paid staff are district personnel who receive remuneration from Title III funds.
Unpaid staff are district personnel who do not receive renumeration from Title III funds but give service to the project.
Ungraded classes are included in Other category.

Type of Paid and Unpaid Personnel by Function	Number of Paid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)	Number of Unpaid Staff Assigned to Project (F.T.E.)
Administrators and/or supervisors		
Teachers		
Prekindergarten		
Kindergarten		
Other elementary 1-6		
Secondary 7-12		
Other	1	
Subject matter specialists		
Technicians		
Pupil personnel workers		
Health services personnel		
Researchers and evaluators		
Planners and developers		
Disseminators		
Other professionals		
Paraprofessional education aides, etc.	1	
Other nonprofessional	1	

To compute full-time equivalent (F.T.E.), add the total number of hours worked per week by the personnel and divide by the number of hours in your regular full-time work week. For example: If each of four staff members works 20 hours per week, each of two staff members works ten hours per week, and each of ten staff members works full time (assume 40 hours for this example), the total hours worked would be 80 plus 20 plus 400, or 500 hours. This total of 500 hours divided by 40 yields an F.T.E. figure of 12.5.

Table VIII

Complete as directed.

Number of consultants paid by Title III funds 0
Number of consultant days paid for by Title III funds 0

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table IX

Complete as directed for the 1972-73 term.

Number of public school professional staff who attended Title III Inservice:

			Estimate Carefully Title III Funds Spent on Training
Orientation sessions up to one week's duration			$
Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration	358	Indirect	$ 1,679
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration			$
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration			$
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration			$
College credit courses - regular term	21	Direct	No additional cost
	49	Indirect	$ 593
College credit courses - summer 1973	113	Direct est.	580
College credit courses - summer term	12	Direct	$ 344

Number of aides (nonprofessional staff) who attended Title III Inservice:

Inservice workshops in regular term of one session to four-weeks' duration			
Inservice workshops in regular term over four-weeks' duration			$
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 one session to four-weeks' duration			$
Inservice workshops in summer 1972 over four-weeks' duration			$
College credit courses - regular term			$
College credit courses - summer term			$

No separate Inservice for aides - Some informally attended above

PART IV (Continued)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table X

Complete as directed.

Number of nonpublic school professional staff involved in Title III inservice in the 1972-73 term 5.

Table XI

Enter number of teachers, aides, and students involved in a Title III, 1972, summer school designed to provide instruction to students.

NONE

Grades	Pre K	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Teachers														
Aides														
Students														

You and/or members of your Project staff may have worked with higher education personnel during the 1972-73 project year (last year). We are interested in the type (formal and informal), and the extent (cost and hours) of any cooperation. Formal participation refers to services performed with remuneration. Informal participation refers to help without remuneration. Please estimate the cost and number of man-days associated with each of the following:

(a) Identifying and/or developing desirable content or educational procedures to be used (program development). None
(1) $_____ cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and ____informal

(b) Search for evaluation help, i.e., for instruments or procedures to be used for evaluation. None
(1) $_____ cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and ____informal

(c) Planning and/or implementing staff development programs (inservice training for project staff). None
(1) $_____ cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and ____informal

(d) Please indicate any other participation.

None

(1) $_____ cost; (2) number of man-days: _____ formal and ____informal

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART V - ABSTRACT

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

GRANTEE SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

PROJECT ABSTRACTS (ESEA, Title III)	STATE	TOTAL PROJECT PERIOD	FROM (Month and year)	TO (Month and year)	PROJECT NO.
	California		7-72	6-73	37-68338-1193-0

NOTE. If project involves handicapped children and/or personnel working with handicapped children who are paid from Title III funds, complete the information on the back of this form.

TITLE OF PROJECT	GRANTEE
ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN (Language Development Through Animal Utilization)	San Diego Unified School District

PROJECTED FUNDING LEVEL FOR PROJECT PERIOD	19— $	19— $	19— $	19— $	19— $	19— $

TARGET POPULATION Indirect: School Districts and/or schools, pre-school throughout the state of California; Direct: Elementary handicapped children in public & private schools in San Diego Metropolitan area - all ethnic and social backgrounds.

PARAGRAPH DESCRIPTION Indirect: Presentations were made to interested school representatives. A demonstration program, teacher workshop, technical assistance were available from the project staff. Direct: In the demonstration program the Zoo Project provided an extended educational program for target students using the facilities of the San Diego Zoo. It provided an innovative approach to the problem of motivating learning and behavior in these children through the use of animals. The program includes 1) a teacher training program enabling teachers to make full use of the zoo experience; 2) conducting the in-zoo program which utilized the zoo setting and animals; 3) conducting the in-school program in which the project director took animals to the classroom to be used in various learning activities; and 4) a comprehensive evaluation to determine the effectiveness of the program.

MAJOR OBJECTIVES Encourage and promote the adoption/adaption of the Zoo Project for Handicapped Children in a minimum of ten other school settings (districts or schools) in the state of California. (1) Create an awareness about the Zoo Project among 100 school districts in the state; (2) Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings; (3) Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting according to established criteria one or more program components; (4) Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adoptors or adapters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings; (5) provide technical assistance for implementation to AA/AO schools and/or Zoos; (6) Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness

ACTIVITIES TO ACHIEVE OBJECTIVES

1. Provide initial and secondary awareness activities for interested school representatives
2. Conduct a model demonstration program at the San Diego Zoo including
   a. Staff training b. In-Zoo and In-School programs
3. Provide inservice training for potential adopters or adapters.
4. Provide technical assistance to interested schools and/or districts.
5. Provide and

EVALUATION STRATEGY Tallying of attendance and evaluation questionnaire at awareness presentations. Questionnaire of potential adoptors/adapters making use of project services.

EVALUATION FINDINGS The Zoo Project approach and materials are being used in over 16 districts with district encouragement and sponsorship. Teachers in over 20 classes in 12 additional districts are using Zoo Project materials and methods. Other institutions such as Zoos, Museums, Hospitals, Humane Societies are using Zoo Project materials and methods.

All activities to achieve objectives listed above were surpassed - See evaluation report.

Page 15a.on back.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HANDICAPPED PROJECT PARTICIPATION ONLY - ESEA TITLE III

1. HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED, PERSONNEL PAID, AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING RECEIVED WITH ESEA TITLE III FUNDS

Type of Handicapped Children Served*	Number of Children Served — Direct Services Only					Full-Time Equivalence of Project Personnel Paid with Title III Funds — Direct Services				Personnel Receiving In-Service Training with Title III Funds — Direct & Indirect Services			
	0-5 years	6-12 years	13-18 years	19 & over	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL	TEACHERS	TEACHER AIDES	OTHER	TOTAL
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)	(i)	(j)	(k)	(l)	(m)
(1) TMR	19	62	31		112								
(2) EMR		265	34		299								
(3) HH													
(4) DEAF													
(5) SI													
(6) VI		9			9								
(7) ED													
(8) CR		10			10								
(9) LD													
(10) OHI													
(11) TOTAL	19	961	65		1,045	1	1	1	3				440

2. NUMBER OF HANDICAPPED CHILDREN SERVED WHO ATTEND NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS: 101

3. DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS

POPULATION	NEGRO	INDIAN	ORIENTAL	SPANISH SURNAME	WHITE (Other than Spanish surname)	OTHER	TOTAL
(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)	(h)
Student	189	4	13	213	626		1,045

4. CHILDREN RECEIVING SERVICES - DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREA

CATEGORY	NUMBER
(1) Urban Areas (over 50,000)	894
(2) Rural Areas (under 2,500)	19
(3) Other Demographic Areas (from 2,500-50,000)	132
(4) TOTAL (Sum of lines (1), (2), and (3))	1045

INSTRUCTIONS

1. CHILDREN SERVED – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, and e an unduplicated count of children served by type of primary handicap *(in public and non-public schools)* and by age group who received direct instructional or related services with Title III funds. This count should include all handicapped children (1) who received direct services from personnel paid with Title III funds and/or (2) who received substantial benefit as a result of the purchase of projects equipment or the provision of significant in-service training of personnel with Title III funds. Do not include handicapped children who received only incidental services, such as preliminary vision screening or audiological testing, etc. Column f should equal columns b, c, d, and e.

PROJECT PERSONNEL – Enter in the appropriate columns g, h, and i corresponding with the primary type of handicapped children served a figure representing an unduplicated count of the full-time personnel plus the full-time equivalency of part-time personnel paid from Title III funds. Full-time personnel are those personnel who were assigned to Title III project activities 40 hours or more per week *(or the number of hours in a regular work week, as determined by the State or local education agency)*. They may be school year, summer program, or 12 month personnel. Column j should equal columns g, h, and i.

IN-SERVICE TRAINING – Enter in the appropriate columns k, l, and m corresponding with primary type of handicapped children served an unduplicated count of all personnel who receive in-service training with Title III funds. Column n should equal columns k, l, and m.

2. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS – Of the total number of handicapped children served with Title III funds *(1)(11), (f)*, indicate the number who attended non-public schools.

3. DISTRIBUTION BY ETHNIC GROUPS – Enter in the appropriate columns b, c, d, e, f, and g an unduplicated count of the handicapped children served with Title III funds by ethnic group membership. Column h should equal columns b, c, d, e, f, and g.

4. DISTRIBUTION BY DEMOGRAPHIC AREAS – Self explanatory.

* TMR = Trainable Mentally Retarded, EMR = Educable Mentally Retarded, HH = Hard of Hearing, SI=Speech Impaired, VI = Visually Impaired, ED = Emotionally Disturbed, CR = Crippled, LD = Learning Disabled, OHI = Other Health Impaired

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART VI - PRODUCTS OF PROJECT

	I Product(s) Developed - 1972-73	II Date mailed to Title III	III Annotations
___	Curriculum guides		
___	Teacher guides		(See also 1972 Products:
X)	Handbooks of materials, techniques and procedures	6/72	Using Animals as Teaching Tools Project No. 0197 Special Education Elementary Teacher's Handbook Looseleaf handbook of teaching suggestions, activities and materials teachers may select from in using animals as motivation for work in the regular school curriculum. Includes master pages for thermal copying.)
___	Monograph		
___	Bibliography		
___	Questionnaires - locally developed		
___	Evaluation tests		
___	Audio tape cassettes		
X	Brochures, newsletters and information sheets	9/72	How Can Animals Help Your Children? Project No. 1193 Elementary Brochure Brochure - describes Zoo Project approach and 1973 Dissemination Services available to schools and/or districts.
___	16 mm Films		
___	8 mm Films		
___	Filmstrips		
___	Instructional workbooks, materials, Tests - locally developed	9/72	Language Development Through Animal Utilization Project No. 1193 Elementary Slide/Tape Slide/tape - Describes Zoo Project approach for using animals for motivation for work in regular school curriculum. Lists evaluation results..
___	Kits		
___	Models		
___	Microcards		
___	Microfilm		
___	Maps		
___	Pictures		
___	Posters		
___	Records		
___	Set		
X	Slides/tape		
___	Viewmasters		
___	Video Tape		
___	(Other)_____		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FINAL PROJECT REPORT

ESEA, TITLE III

COMPONENT III

Program Narrative Report

CONTEXT

The Locale

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What is the locale of the program?
2. What is the density of the population?
3. What are the population trends?
4. What are the major occupations of people in the locale?
5. What is the unemployment rate or trend?
6. What proportion of families in the locale are receiving welfare assistance?

1. The program operated from the Otto Education Center of the San Diego Zoo. The program covered Elementary Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Retarded classes in the cities of San Diego, La Mesa, Spring Valley, Chula Vista and El Cajon. In addition there was some coverage in other small districts in San Diego County.

2. The population for the City of San Diego is 762,800 with an average household size (city wide) of 2.78/unit.

3. Population trends indicate growth upward.

April 1, 1970 population was listed at 697,027 and in January 1972 was reported as 740,000

Population predictions are as follows:

April 1975	787,000
April 1980	857,000
April 1985	931,000
April 1990	996,000

4. Manufacturing is the major occupation in the San Diego Metropolitan area.

5. The unemployment rate is 4.8.

6. Not available.

The locale of the indirect dissemination program covered the entire state of California. Constant use of project services were made in Southern California. Information covering the above questions for the state of California not available to this office.

The School System

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What grade levels do the schools serve?
2. How many pupils are there in the school system? How many schools?
3. Are there any significant trends in the school system in enrollment, withdrawal, or transfer?
4. What is the per pupil cost of education in the school system?
5. What is the recent financial history of the school system?

1. The school districts involved in the Zoo Project are either Unified K-12 districts or Elementary K-8 districts.

2. In October 1972 the school district enrollment figures were:

K-6	68,853
7-9	29,483
10- 12	26,612
Cont./Adj.	821
	125,719

There were 160 schools.

3. Enrollment trend is down.

4. The 1971-72 per pupil cost of education in the school system was $897.33.

5. Expenses have been increasing more rapidly than income. This has necessitated program cutbacks.

Answers to above questions are for the direct demonstration program only, as such figures for the entire state are not available to this office.

Districts using the services of the project generally were interested in help at the elementary level, however, a number of junior high and one senior high teacher took the workshop.

A number of districts were interested in the Zoo Project approach for help with the deaf and hearing handicapped because of the language motivation provided by the approach.

Needs Assessment

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What was the starting point for needs assessment?
2. How were the specific needs of the pupils identified?
3. What were these specific needs? Which were selected for the program?

Needs for this particular statewide dissemination program were determined by the State Department of Education before selection of the nine projects included in the 1972-73 "California Plan." The needs of the various districts and/or pupils were balanced against the available successfully tested projects and appropriate exemplary and innovative projects were then selected for dissemination through a state administered program of dissemination and diffusion.

Each adoptor district or school will have identified the problems which cause their needs, and will adapt the project's solution to fit their own local resources and needs.

Needs of the local "producer" district for a program were determined in the following manner: At the time of the inception of this program, in 1969, there were close to four thousand children enrolled in programs for Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Retarded in the project area. These children had been identified through test data and teacher judgment as being in need of special attention. These children very commonly have their greatest difficulty in communication skills. As language, reading and verbal skills are the heart of the educational process, there is a need to stimulate this group in these areas.

A review of the literature and experience of local teachers revealed that certain learning needs common to these children must be met in their learning activities. These needs included:

- The need for direct experience rather than abstractions.
- The need for approaches that appeal to all the senses.
- The need to relate school activities to meaningful situations thus enabling children to transfer what has been learned into meaningful behavior.
- The need for meaningful repetition without over stimulation.
- The need for motivational experiences in which children are vitally interested.
- The need for behavior modification both passive and aggressive.
- The need for opportunity for developing relationships.

It was felt by the planning committee that a program using animals as a motivating force could take advantage of the fascination all humans have for living things and meet all the unique learning needs listed above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Historical Background

1. Did the program exist prior to the time period covered in the present report?
2. Is the program a modification of a previously existing program?
3. How did the program originate?
4. If special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents and the community, how were these solved so that the program could be introduced?
5. Provide a brief history of planning. Indicate which planning efforts were successful or were not successful. Describe how non-profit private schools and other agencies were involved in the planning.

The 1972-73 phase of the ZOO PROJECT program was a "diffusion" year of the project in which we took the successes and experience of the previous three years and shared them with interested districts and/or schools throughout the state. The program was modified in that the local program was continued as a demonstration program, and staff hours were increased for extra help when the project director was absent on dissemination activities. The origination and planning of the program were described under "Needs Assessment" above.

No special problems were encountered in gaining acceptance of the program by parents or community. We have been received with great enthusiasm and appreciation throughout the history of the project.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Scope of the Program

1. What numbers and kinds of participants were served by the program?
2. What were the specified objectives of the program?

All interested persons were invited to a series of eleven ACSA/EXPO presentations up and down the state during the fall of 1972. In addition, the Zoo Project contacted local Zoo and park staffs and nearby CANHC (California Association of Neurologically Handicapped Children) chapters. All who attended these presentations received information on the project. Those who expressed an interest were sent a package of materials further describing the program and outlining the services available.

Districts, Zoos, and groups then participated in several ways:

1. Secondary awareness level presentations to staffs.
2. Inservice workshops from two to sixteen hours in length depending on the needs of the district.
3. Demonstration lessons.
4. On site visits to the Zoo Project.
5. Utilization of Zoo Project materials (provided free to all districts providing workshops of four hours or more duration).
6. Technical advice and assistance when requested.
7. Initial awareness level presentations to schools, districts, groups not contacted in initial ACSA/EXPO presentations.

Eighteen workshops were presented to a total of 552 teachers and/or administrators, district staff, etc. This included training 33 teachers new to the local demonstration program at the San Diego Zoo. Counting all participants at the awareness level 3,105 participants were included in the program. The number of children is estimated over 4,000.

OBJECTIVES: Encourage and promote the adoption or adaption of the ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school settings (districts or schools) in the state of California.

1. Create an awareness about the ZOO PROJECT among 100 school districts in the state.
2. Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings.
3. Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting according to established criteria one or more program components.
4. Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adopter/adapters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings.
5. Provide technical assistance for implementation to Adoption/Adaption schools and/or Zoos.
6. Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness.

Personnel

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What kinds and numbers of personnel were added by the program?
2. What were their most important duties and activities?
3. How much time did each type of personnel devote to these responsibilities?
4. What special qualifications suited personnel to the requirements of their jobs?
5. What special problems were dealt with in recruiting or maintaining staff?

The Zoo Project was able to operate with a staff of three:

The Project Director planned the master schedule for classes, buses, and animals both In-Zoo and In-School, instructed the inservice training workshops, assisted teachers in both programs, interpreted the program to visitors and to outside groups, acted as liaison between the Zoo, the district and other districts and private schools, initiated all records and reports about the Zoo Project, was responsible for project equipment and use of loaned Zoo facilities, and was responsible for keeping within the project budget. He conducted the major part of the dissemination activities listed in this report.

The Project Secretary served as general office manager and assistant to the Project Director; she assisted teachers, maintained schedules, prepared masters for reproduction, maintained records, acted as receptionist and performed other secretarial duties. She received visitors in the absence of the Project Director and assisted with the inservice training.

The Animal Attendant, formerly a Zoo employee, became a district employee under the 1972-73 project. She was responsible for the daily feeding and cleaning of animals, their daily handling and training, cleaning and maintaining the workroom and classrooms, maintained stock of animal supplies, assisted teachers in their use of animals, was available as a resource person, accompanied classes in the Zoo and conducted the In-School portion of the program during the absence of the Project Director, and performed other related duties.

These personnel devoted their full time to the operation of the Zoo Project.

Other than the normal qualifications for these jobs, the positions required willingness to handle ALL kinds of animals, a willingness and ability to work with children who sometimes may have bizarre physical or behavioral characteristics, the ability to make decisions concerning the appropriateness of an activity for a particular situation in regard to the safety of animals and children involved.

Although these positions very often require irregular lunch hours, and unreimbursed overtime, we have had no problem in recruiting or maintaining staff.

Organizational Details

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What is the period of time covered by your report?
2. How much of the entire program does this cover?
3. Where were program activities located?
4. What special physical arrangements were used in these locations?
5. What provisions, if any, were made for periodic review of the program?
6. What important decisions were made on the basis of such reviews?
7. What provisions, if any, were made for inservice training?

1,2,3. This report covers only the 1972-73 dissemination grant period. This was the fourth operational year of the Zoo Project. Program activities were located throughout the state of California, wherever schools felt that the project approach met their needs. Local activities of the demonstration program was located in the San Diego Zoo and in the classrooms of 41 In-School classes throughout San Diego County.

4. Rather than make special arrangements for the program in each area, we worked to adapt the program to their local resources.

5,6. Review as conducted after each presentation to determine new needs, unexpected benefits, suggestions for change or improvement. Any need for change pointed out were incorporated into the program.

7. Inservice training was the heart of the program. It was the major request of participating districts. In many cases the district sponsored the training and then allowed teachers to develop their own programs with district approval.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Activities or Services

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. What were the main activities (or services) in the program?
2. How were these activities (or services) related to specified program objectives?
3. What methods were used in carrying out each activity (or service)?
4. What was a typical day's or week's schedule of activities for the children (or others) who received the program?
5. How were pupils grouped for the various program activities?
6. What were teacher-pupil ratios (or aid-pupil, or adult-pupil, and so on) in each of these groupings?
7. How did pupils (or others) receive feedback on their individual daily progress?
8. How did parents receive feedback on their child's progress?
9. What amounts and kinds of practice, review, and quiz activities were provided for pupils (or others) in the program?
10. What special provisions were made for motivating pupils (or others)?
11. If a comparison group was used, what were important differences in the activities and methods used in this group and the activities and methods used with the program group?

1,2,3. The main function of the project staff was to provide the services which would enable teachers to adopt or adapt the Zoo Project approach. This was accomplished through providing awareness level presentations, teacher workshops, operating the demonstration program, and other assistance as requested. These were the objectives of the program. All services were available on request and were altered to meet the local needs and resources of the requesting school.

4. A typical workshop schedule covered three main areas:

   a) Animal handling to help the teacher feel confident in working with animals that tmight be available for her class.
   b) Background information on animal groups and specific information about particular animals.
   3) Sharing and developing activities and materials that would meet the needs of her particular class.

The workshops were expanded or contracted from 2 hours to 16 hours depending upon the needs of the district. When applied to the classroom, a typical lesson would involve the teacher introducing an animal such as the snake; talking about it, pointing out and explaining any actions or movements that might tend to be startling; demonstrating how to hold it and listing some particular things to look for on it. By this time the children would be eager to touch and hold the animal. It would be passed to every child but nobody would be forced to touch it who did not want to. (Almost always, after the elaborate introduction every child will take the animal.) One or more children might have a polaroid picture taken with the animal. The group would then discuss the animal and summarize the items they had been directed to look for. An art lesson or written lesson might follow, or research for further information; or if in a zoo, study or related animals in the zoo. The polaroid picture could be used later for extending the experience, using it as the basis for a written story or oral language activities. In School the children would be responsible for reading directions and being responsible for the care of the animal. In most classes, after children became "expert" on an animal, they might be allowed to report on and "share" the animal in other classrooms.

Activities or Services (Cont'd)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5-6. The project did no grouping of pupils for various program activities. Teacher-pupil ratios were those normally established in their various schools or districts for regular or special education classes. At the demonstration program, if the teacher wanted additional help, and members of the staff were available, they would accompany groups in the zoo. In addition, high school tutor guides from special education classes in one of the local high schools were available if the teacher chose to ask for them.

7-8-9. Feedback to parents or pupils was not an organized part of this program. It is dependent on the policy or practice of the particular school or district involved. As we were interested in motivation of pupils rather than accumulation of knowledge, practic review and quiz activities were not a part of this project, although individual teachers may have included them in their program.

10. Motivation is the major goal of the Zoo Project. We believe that living things present a special fascination for children, and that teachers can take advantage of this fascination to teach school subjects. Animals provide a multi-sensory stimulation not filled by the standard approach. We feel the animal experience breaks up the pattern of failure the child may have had from the standard school approach. It suddenly places the child in neutral non-school territory being stimulated by a completely different and unorthodox approach. Suddenly he finds a reason to do school type tasks; but they are his own realistic reasons, based on needs that he feels.

11. Comparison groups were not needed to meet the goals of this year's project.

Instructional Equipment and Materials

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. Were special materials developed or adapted for the program? How and by whom?
2. What other major items of equipment and materials did the program require? In what amounts?
3. How were key aids and materials used in connection with the various program activities?
4. If a comparison is being made between program and nonprogram persons, were there important differences between these groups in kinds and amounts of materials provided, or in methods of use?

1. A slide/tape presentation was developed for use in the ACSA/EXPO initial awareness portion of the program as was a brochure entitled "How Can Animals Help Your Children?" These were produced by the Zoo Project staff with the aid of Mr. Don Kelly of the State Department of Education. The Zoo Project Handbook was reprinted for use in the workshops. Additional handout materials were produced as needed to fit local workshop needs.

2-3. A synchronized slide/tape projector was purchased for use in the ACSA/EXPO phase of the program and for use by the Zoo Project staff when making presentations in the absence of the project director.

Equipment, minor in cost, but major in importance are the cages and other animal equipment needed for the In-School program.

The slide camera and polaroid camera obtained during the first year of funding continued to be items of utmost importance. Every class received eight or more pictures of the children interacting with the animals for use in motivating language activities.

The project van leased during the year provided the necessary transportation needed for the In-School portion of the program, and was used for hauling animals and materials to workshops within driving distance of San Diego.

4. There was no "outside" control group used in this project.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Parent-Community Involvement

1. What role, if any, did parents have in the program?
2. Were meetings held with parents? Why? How often?
3. What role, if any, did various community groups have in the program?
4. How was the community kept informed?
5. If problems with parents or the community affected the program, what steps, if any, were taken to remedy the situation?

1. No parents had a direct role in the program. In the local demonstration program, some parents accompanied classes to the Zoo at the request of the teacher. Several letters were received from parents. Some teachers distributed evaluation sheets to parents. All from whom we heard were very supportive of the program.

2-3. Some parent and community groups contacted the project for information or asked for a speaker. All such invitations were accepted.

4. The Zoo Project was described in two local newspaper articles, one local radio program and one local television program. An illustrated article was published in the San Diego Zoological Society's magazine ZOONOOZ. All invitations to speak to PTA's, service clubs, educational groups were accepted by the project staff.

5. No problems with parents or the community were encountered.

Budget

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1. From what sources were program funds obtained?
2. What was the total cost of the program?
3. What period of time was covered by these funds?
4. What is the per pupil cost of the program? What was the formula for computing this figure?
5. How does the per pupil cost of the program compare with the normal per pupil cost of the schools in the program?
6. Where can the reader get more detailed budget information?
7. Of the total cost of the program, give rough dollar estimates of developmental costs, implementation costs and operational costs.
8. Give the costs for the entire project period by budget categories (i.e., professional salaries, contracted services, etc.).

Complete breakdowns of budget figures have not been determined at this writing. These figures will be provided as a part of the financial report which will be forwarded to Sacramento within 90 days.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Special Factors

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

For use of potential adopters of the program:

1. What modifications of the program are possible?
2. What are the suggested steps in adopting this program?
3. What are some things others should avoid in adopting this program?
4. Can the program be phased in, beginning on a small scale? How?
5. Can parts of the program be adopted without taking the whole program? What parts?

1. This program need not be limited to localities having zoos nor need it be limited to Mentally Retarded and Educationally Handicapped classes.

The program could be operated on an In-Zoo or In-School basis only, or individual teachers could adapt after having attended the teacher training workshop. All animals in the In-School program have been obtained through donations. Cages are readily available and all other necessary materials could be found in practically all school systems at a minimum cost. The basic approach to the In-Zoo program could be adapted to any zoo, animal shelter, farm, park, aquarium, etc.

2. The teacher training is the key step in this program. The teacher must be secure in working with the animals. If she is afraid, the children will sense it, and the whole point of the program is lost. She needs background on the animals and needs to have selected activities and materials to use with the animals. Start with either In-Zoo or In-School for a year, then expand to include both programs.

3-4. Use only volunteers. Don't assign teachers to the program. Don't try to operate either program without teacher training. Make sure animals are handleable and safe before allowing children to use them. Don't allow substitute teachers to try to carry on in the teacher's place.

4. To replicate this project a school could easily begin with what it has at hand and build activities around small, less expensive animals available in most communities, as well as substituting media and "one-shot" visits for part of the program. A large city zoo is very helpful, but many of the project ideas are applicable whether a full scale zoo is available or not. Using animals as motivation can occur in many other settings.

5. Yes, see #1 above.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dissemination

Discuss how project information was disseminated during the past budget period.

1. Provide an estimate of the number of unsolicited requests for information from both within and outside the project area.

2. List the number of visitors from outside the project area.

3. Provide the cost of dissemination during the last budget period.

4. Provide the total cost of dissemination including prior budget periods (if possible).

The whole focus of this year's program has been on dissemination of the Zoo Project approach.

Initial awareness presentations occurred as a part of a series of "ACSA/EXPO" meetings in eleven locations throughout the state of California. In these meetings, a brief description of the Zoo Project was given along with description of services available to teachers/schools/districts.

In addition to the teachers, administrators and other educators invited to these meetings through ACSA, the Zoo Project sent special invitations to local zoos, acquariums and animal parks and local CANHC chapters (California Association of Neurologically Handicapped Children), indicating where and when the closest ACSA/EXPO presentation would be.

Persons indicating an interest in the Zoo Project approach on ACSA/EXPO evaluation forms were sent a package of materials giving further information. These materials included

an introductory letter
a list of services available
a description of the different kinds of Zoo Project workshops available
a list of workshop objectives, goals, and outcomes
a suggested workshop schedule

When deemed appropriate, additional materials were sent such as the brochure, copies of Zoonooz magazine, extracts from the Zoo Project handbook, and personal letters to answer particular questions.

Additional initial awareness contacts were made by mailings sent out through the Modesto Prevocational Occupational Education program, through newspaper and magazine articles, through word of mouth and through displays.

Dissemination (Cont'd)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dissemination activities were considered to have two purposes for the Zoo Project. One was to promote the adoption or adaption of the Zoo Project approach in other areas. The second purpose was to encourage the continuation and expansion of the program locally after federal funding had ceased.

Districts, schools, or individuals who were interested in the Zoo Project approach then contacted us for one or more of the following services:

1) Secondary awareness level meetings in which a more complete presentation was provided of the material given in the ACSA/EXPO presentation. Such meetings were given to school staffs, departmental groups, professional organizations, college classes, parent groups, and service clubs.

2) Visitations were available for all visitors interested in seeing the project in action. A model demonstration program was available at the San Diego Zoo for an In-Zoo type program and In-School classes were available throughout the year as models for the In-School portion of our program. All teachers applying for inclusion in the program agreed to have visitors at any time during their particpation.

3) Teacher training workshops were provided to all requesting schools or districts. Organization of the workshop varied according to the needs and resources of the school or district involved. Many districts were not interested in establishing a district wide program, but were interested in sponsoring a workshop that would expose their teachers to the Zoo Project approach and encourage teachers to adapt features of the program that met their own immediate needs.

4) Demonstrations. Two districts requested demonstration lessons in their own area with children from their own schools. The project director provided these lessons for them.

5) Idea Fairs-Displays. In addition to Western States Exp and CSBA participation, the Zoo Project was requested to provide a display and personal assistance for Professional "Idea fairs," swapshop meetings and conferences.

6) Technical Assistance. From time to time during the year the project was contacted for additional technical assistance by various agencies inside and outside the state of California. Such assistance was provided through correspondence.

7) In addition information about the project was disseminated in one local television program, a radio tape distributed to six local radio stations, 2 local newspaper articles and an article in the San Diego Zoological Society's publication "Zoonooz" which has world-wide distribution.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY: The Zoo Project Staff directly participated in dissemination activities in the following ways:

	Activity	Date	No. of People
11	ACSA/EXPO Activities	Fall 1972	385
	Information Packets	Fall 1972	355
7	Secondary Awareness Presentations: (potential adopters/adapters)		
	Orange Center School District	10/18	16
	Santee School District	11/6	17
	Duarte Unified School District	1/11	19
	Burlingame Teacher Institute	1/26	54
	Modesto City Schools	2/5	43
	Mt. Helix Montessori Academy	3/29	31
	Ontario/Montclair Reading Council	3/3	42
15	Secondary Awareness Presentations: (local continuation and expansion of the program)		
	University of California Extension	7/19	27
	St. Kieran's School, El Cajon	10/27	50
	California State University, San Diego	11/7	45
	North Park Kiwanis	11/7	37
	San Diego CEC (Council for Exceptional Children)	11/16	92
	University of California Extension	11/28	46
	NSTA Convention	12/1	27
	Multi-Age Teachers	2/13	17
	University of California Extension	2/21	21
	Southwestern College Extension	3/14	33
	California State University, San Diego	3/27	45
	Southwestern College	4/4	52
	Deaf and Hard-of-Hearing Teachers	5/3	20
	Women's International Sorority	5/16	18
	Chula Vista Lions	6/7	57
4	Demonstrations:		
	Orange Center	10/18	6
	Burlingame	6/25)	
	" "	6/26)	56
	" "	6/27)	
	Visits		
	Local		127
	Other than local		58

Dissemination (Cont'd)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY: (Cont'd)

	Activity	Date	No. of People
4	**Displays, Idea Fairs, Conferences**		
	ACSA/CSBA	12/1 - 12/3	
	San Diego City and County CEC	2/21	
	Western States Expo	4/13 - 4/15	
	SDTA Teacher Fair	6/9	
	Staff Training - (potential adopters/adapters)		
	See detailed summary sheets		
6	**Staff Training** - (local continuation and expansion of program)		
	Zoo Project summer workshop	Summer 1972	11
	" " fall workshop	Fall 1972	21
*	California Lutheran College Extension	6/73	28 Est.
*	San Diego City College	7/9/73	27 Est.
	" " " "	7/16/73	30 Est.
	" " " "	7/23/73	28 Est.
12	**Requests for Technical Assistance**		
	See detailed summary sheet		
3	**Public Relations Activities**		
	National City Public Library - Animal display	11/3	100
	Mentally Retarded Arts and Crafts Group	5/8	27
	Fairhaven Pet Show	6/1	300
1	Television Interview	11/3	
1	Radio Interview (repeated 6 or more times)	10/20	
1	Zoonooz Article (San Diego Zoological Society)	2/73	
2	San Diego Union Newspaper articles	11/5 and 3/11	

No. of Brochures	Fall 1972	Cost	$440.00	5,500	950 left
No. of Handbooks		Cost	$1,513.00	675	None left (Final printing not accomplished at this date. All copies expected to be used in local program and in answering requests from outside area.)

* Paid for by other than Title III funds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

SUMMARY OF ZOO PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND FINDINGS 1972-73

OBJECTIVE: Encourage and promote the adoption or adaption of the ZOO PROJECT FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN in a minimum of ten other school settings (districts or schools) in the state of California.

The Zoo Project approach is being used in over 16 districts with district encouragement and sponsorship. In addition, teachers in over 20 classes in 12 additional districts are using Zoo Project materials and methods in their classrooms. Other institutions such as Zoos, Museums, Hospitals, Humane Societies are using Zoo Project materials and methods.

1. Create an awareness about the ZOO PROJECT among 100 school districts in the state.

Presentations were made to 385 people through ACSA/EXPO. 355 information packets were sent out to individuals representing 109 districts. 7 outside awareness presentations were made to 222 people. 15 awareness presentations were made within San Diego County to 587 people. Zoo Project personnel participated in 2 conference activities in which brochures and oral information were given. Brochures were made available to other dissemination activities throughout the state during the year.

2. Operate a model demonstration program capable of accommodating 25 visitors per week and demonstrate to potential adopters from 25 school and/or zoo settings.

The Zoo Project handled groups of visitors from as few as one to as many as 60 people. A total of 185 people visited the project during the 1972-73 school year for 121 groups.

3. Select 10 districts or schools interested in adopting or adapting, according to established criteria, one or more program components.

All districts requesting services received those services except for those requesting services during the 1973-74 school year. See above information and following information for details.

4. Conduct 10 staff training seminars for potential adopters/adapters from 25 school and/or Zoo settings.

18 teacher training workshops were held for 552 people. These represented teachers from 27 districts.

5. Provide technical assistance for implementation to Adapters/Adopters schools and/or Zoos.

Technical assistance was provided whenever requested whether to school districts, Zoos, parent groups or individual teachers. Such assistance was provided through personal contact, telephone conversation and by letter.

6. Evaluate the diffusion process for effectiveness.

An ongoing evaluation was carried on throughout the year, collecting data, evaluating presentations, workshops, and the demonstration program. Adjustments were made based on results of such evaluation. This evaluation report is a result of this evaluation process.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION
(Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)

DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person) NOTE: Addresses and telephone numbers for contact persons listed on these pages will be found in Appendix A.	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0 0.0 Component	1.0 INITIAL AWARENESS: In Zoo	1.0 INITIAL AWARENESS: In School	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: DISTRICT MAILING	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: OTHER	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: NUMBER OF PEOPLE	2.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS: HANDBOOK	2.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS: OTHERS
1) Alhambra City Schools - Granada School - Mrs. Brenda Sorenson - Supvr. Aural Education			AA			X				30	
2) Arcadia Unified School District - Holly Avenue School - W. G. Smith, Principal) Longley Way School - Ross Browne, Principal)		AA	AA	X						3	
3) Burlingame School District - Mrs. Lois Watson - Curriculum Consultant			AA	A			1/26	A - T	54	30	15
McKinley			AA								
Franklin			AA								
Washington			AA								
Pershing			AA								
Roosevelt			AA								
Mrs. A. M. Elario - Director, Summer Reading Clinic											
4) Chino Unified School District - Ed Reyes - Asst. Supt. -Instruction Los Serranos School) Glenmeade School)			AA			A				4	
5) Chula Vista City Schools - Mrs. Elizabeth Kay - General Supervisor			AA			X				16	12
6) Duarte Unified School District - Joe Davis - Title I Director (Maxwell School)			X	X			1/11	A - T	19	4	
7) Garden Grove Unified School District - Excelsior School - Leroy Morton, Principal			AA	X						4	
Hill School - Robert Gresham - Principal			AA	X						3	
8) Little Lake School District - Earle Snow - Consultant for the Deaf			AA			X					
Fairford School			AA			X				18	
Jersey Avenue School			AA			X					
Lakeview School											

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS		VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		4.0 STAFF TRAINING		5.0 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL				
HANDBOOK	OTHERS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A-Admin T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
				4/28	22					11	4	33.66	261.36	Budgt'd	13	87	Adapting on Optional teacher basis particularly in hard-of-hearing and deaf programs with district sponsorship. Making use of loan program of local humane society.
30																	
				1/9	57					7½	2	12.28	112.49	$10	22	600	No district funds expended; district sponsoring optional individual teacher adaptation; 1 staff member attended additional training at La Verne Coll
3																	
										42	11	293.	889.		6	112	High interest. District sponsoring adaptation of program on optional individual teacher basis. Encouraging use of local Junior Museum animal loan program. Memberships paid for by district. Asked for special demonstrations with their own children during summer reading clinic.
															2	50	
30	15			3/27	24										3	75	
															1	20	
														210	1	27	
						6/25 to 6/27	A T S	1 5 50	6/25 to 6/27								
										4	4	8.63	97.		33	1025	Adapting components of the program school wide; planning to expand next year; district planning to reproduce handbook materials for local distribution.
4				4/10	37												
				Feb-Mar.	15	Informal contacts with teacher planning animal lending library				19	16	5.00	388.	Budgt'd	24	112+	District sponsoring adaptation of program on optional individual teacher basis. Will conduct own summer training program. Plans for district animal lending library and expansion of the program.
16	12																
										6	4	17	114		no figures as yet		No response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire
19	4																
										6	4	7	115		17	500	District sponsoring individual teacher adaption of program. Teachers buying animals and cages with own money. Considering inaugurating a district wide program. Also making use of animal loans from local pet shop. Some teachers have purchased handbook on their own.
4				1/17	19					8	4	7	131		22	610	
3				3/22	24												
															3	16	All classes in deaf program are adapting the In-School component. Report high success in motivation of language. Have been fortunate in donations and gifts of animals and cages.
															6	35	
										20	4	32	314	50	1	3	
18				2/2-3	16									See note			

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION
(Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)

DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0 0.0			1.0 INITIAL AWARENESS			1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS			2.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	
	Component	In Zoo	In School	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	HANDBOOK	OTHERS
9) Los Angeles Unified School District - Salvin Elem. School - Rose Engel - Principal			AA	X						16	
10) Modesto City Schools - Jerrold Frye			X	X			2/5	A - T	43		
11) Mt. Helix Montessori Academy - Barbara Hamilton - Secretary			AA			X	3/29	A-T-P	31		
12) Ocean View School District - Lark View TMR Facility - Mrs. Rose Ludwig - Principal			AA			X				25	
13) Ontario-Montclair Reading Council - Mrs. Hazel Wilson			0			X	3/3	A-T	42		
14) Orange Center School District - Orange Center School - George Nagel, Dist. Supt.			0	X			10-18	A-T			
15) Riverside County Schools - Mrs. Eleanor Dunn - Director, Prolexia, Title III			AA	X							5
Collett (Alvord)			AA								
Parkridge (Corona)			AA								
Arnold Heights (Moreno)			AA								
West Riverside (Jurupa)			AA								
16) Santee School District - Rio Seco School - Russ James			AA			X	11-6	A - T	17		
Doug Kay - Teacher			AA			X				2	
17) Victor School District - Mrs. Beth Hill - Curriculum Coordinator			AA							3	
Irwin School											
Del Rey School											
Parkview School											
18) Westminster School District - Rhonda Mahan - Lang. Dev. Specialist-Title VI Preschool		X	X	X						2	

CONTINUATION AND EXPANSION OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM

San Diego Unified School District

See SUMMARY: Dissemination Activities pp. 32-33

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

	4.0						5.0									
VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL					
DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A-Admin T-Teachers S-Students P-Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED		
		1-10	40	Request help next year				9½	2	20	175	∅	9	100		Using Zoo Project approach; plan to continue next year on an individual optional choice basis. Hoping to expand to other classrooms. Teachers obtain own animals and cages. Request further assistance next year.
								1½	4	63	117		no figures as yet			No response to Evaluation Questionnaire as yet.
				Have requested technical assistance next year.				1	1	7	27		no figures as yet			Planning animal collection; no response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire.
		5/18-19	22					19	4	40	330	85	no figures as yet			Training occurred too late in year for full adaption this year. Planning active program next year with district providing animals, pens, cages, etc.
								3	6	∅	∅	10	no figures as yet			No response as yet to Evaluation Questionnaire. Produced Chino contact. Several participants attended La Verne College class - adapting in own districts on individual basis.
					T-S	6	10-18	2	1	∅	29.00					
2		2-15	52					10	4	7.00	143	5.00	4 2 4 3	120 60 120 90		Zoo Project approaches being used. Several participants attended the La Verne College workshop and now adapting the In School program in their own classrooms.
								1	1	7.00	46					Planning own animal lending library.
	3/23 4															
52		5-10	52					6	5	11	127		6 4 2	300 100 LD-MR		Using Zoo Project approach; plan to continue next year on an individual teacher optional choice basis. District will rpovide cages, etc.
12	1/16 2															Planning to use materials in Title VI Language Project

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION
(Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)

DISTRICT:
(Schools and Contact Person)

ADOPTION = AO
ADAPTION = AA
UNCERTAIN = X
NO = 0

0.0

	Component	In Zoo	In School	1.0 INITIAL AWARENESS: ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS: DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	2.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS: HANDBOOK	OTHERS
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS:											
1) La Verne College - John Mainiero			AA			X				29	
2) San Francisco Zoological Society - Beverly Rongren - Docent Coordinator		X		X							
Mrs. David Gibson - Junior League		X			X				3		15
Mrs. Helen Lustig - Staff & Curriculum Development Spec. - San Francisco Unified Schools		X	X			X					
3) San Mateo Junior Museum - Mary Ann Danielson		X	X			X	See Note		3		
4) Mrs. Florence B. Clayton		X	X			X			1		10

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2.0				4.0		5.0										
MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS		VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION			PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
HANDBOOK	OTHERS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date)	WORK WITH: A-Admin T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
29				3-29	27					25	5	41	331	(810)	23	885	23 teachers responded to questionnaire As a result of the workshop, individual teacher adaption reported in the following districts: Alvord - Terrace School - 2 Collett School Arcadia - Longley Way Bonita - Raymon Chaffey Union High - Alta Loma Chino - Neuman G. Meade E. J. Marshall - 2 Corona - Vicentia Hemet - Cottonwood Hueneme - Bard Jarupa - West Riverside Ontario-Montclair - West Riverside - Mariposa - 2 Placentia - Orchard Riverside - Harrison Trona - Trona Valley Oaks - University Unassigned teachers - 2 Materials shared by these teachers with 256 additional teachers.
3	15					3/27	other			4	(Burlingame)		19				Expressed strong interest. Change in Zoo administration caused abandonment of plans. Local Junior League group also interested in Zoo Project approach for Docent Training if cooperative plan can be worked out with the Zoo when new administration is established. San Francisco School Curriculum Specialist also exploring adapting both In Zoo and In School programs.
3				See Note						See Burlingame				Cost absorbed by Burlingame			Attended Burlingame presentations. 3 staff members took training. Are making use of Zoo Project approach in the Museum and in their animal loan program.
1	10	2/22	1														Graduate student in Educational Psychology, Calif. State University Los Angeles. Is planning to develop a similar program and encourage adaptation of it in a variety of settings in the greater Los Angeles area. Has demonstrated Zoo Project approaches and materials in graduate classes. Sees potential for use in residential treatment facilities.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1972-73 ADOPTION/ADAPTION ACTIVITIES:

LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT THROUGH ANIMAL UTILIZATION
(Zoo Project for Handicapped Children)

DISTRICT: (Schools and Contact Person)	ADOPTION = AO ADAPTION = AA UNCERTAIN = X NO = 0 0.0			1.0 INITIAL AWARENESS			1.0 SECONDARY AWARENESS				2.0 MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS	
	Component	In Zoo	In School	ACSA/EXPO	DISTRICT MAILING	OTHER	DATE	A - Admin. T - Teachers S - Students P - Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE		HANDBOOK	OTHERS
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS (CONT'D)												
5) Lion Country Safari - Brenda Easley - Education		X	X	X							1	
6) San Diego Humane Society - Judy Immenschuh			AA			X					1	8
SCHOOL DISTRICTS OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA												
Anaconda City Schools - Anaconda, Montana Mrs. Madalen Burt W. K. Dwyer School		AA	AA			X					2	3
ADAPTERS OTHER THAN SCHOOLS OR SCHOOL DISTRICTS OUTSIDE CALIFORNIA												
1) Larue D. Carter Memorial Hospital - Indianapolis, Ind. Mrs. Susan Cooper -			X			X					1	10
2) New York Zoological Society - Bronx, New York Mr. Donald Fine - Education Dept. Mr. Robert A. Brown - Assoc. Curator for Early Childhood Education						X						10
3) Taronga Zoo - Syndey, Australia - Barry Foy - Acting Senior Education Officer		X				X					1	12

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2.0				4.0		5.0											
MATERIALS SENT: NO. OF DIFFERENT DOCUMENTS		VISIT/DEMONSTRATION		STAFF TRAINING		TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE FOR IMPLEMENTATION				PRODUCER SCHOOL				CONSUMER SCHOOL			
HANDBOOK	OTHERS	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	MONITOR (Date	WORK (A-Admin T-Teachers S-Students P-Parents	NUMBER OF PEOPLE	DATE	PROFESSIONAL STAFF TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL TIME (Hours)	TRAVEL COST	TOTAL COST	FUNDS EXPENDED	NUMBER OF STAFF INVOLVED	NUMBER OF STUDENTS INVOLVED	
1																	Establishing education program, requested handbook.
1	8	9/19	1	Attended workshop.					In-formal								Used Zoo Project as model in developing a program to teach humane values in a series of one time visits to schools throughout San Diego County using live animals. Adapted materials and ideas. Informal assistance from time to time as needed.
2	3	Also visited Project 71-72												100	4	150	Adapting Zoo Project approach and materials schoolwide on informal individual optional basis. Plan to expand the program next year. Using handbook as a model for developing own materials.
1	10																Adapting Zoo Project approaches to recreation therapy program of hospital in Indianapolis working with emotionally disturbed children. Making use of animals from local Zoo and humane society. Using Zoo Project approaches and materials; adapted Zoo Project application in requesting federal funds for Indianapolis local project.
	10																Emphasizing use of animals in teaching subjects other than science.
1	12																Are expanding education program. Seeking means of using animals in a variety of ways. As a result of receiving Zoo Project materials and information, they altered points of interest in their new program.

ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALHAMBRA CITY SCHOOLS
Mrs. Brenda S. Sorenson, Supvr
Aural Education
2121 W. Main Street
Alhambra, California 91801
(213) 289-5411

ARCADIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
William G. Smith, Principal
Holly Avenue School
360 W. Duarte Road
Arcadia, California 91006
(213) 446-0131 Ext 207

Longley Way School
Ross Browne, Principal
2601 Longley Way
Arcadia, California 91006
(213) 446-0131 Ext 217

BURLINGAME SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Lois Watson
Curriculum Consultant
1560 Newlands
Burlingame, California 94010
(415) 344-1743

Mrs. Alice M. Elario
Director, Summer Reading Laboratory
McKinley School
701 Paloma Drive
Burlingame, California 94010
(415) 344-9313

CHINO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Edward Reyes, Asst. Supt. of Instruction
5130 Riverside
Chino, California 91710
(714) 628-1201

CHULA VISTA CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Elizabeth C. Kay
General Supervisor
84 East J Street - P.O. Box 907
Chula Vista, California 92012
(714) 422-8341

DUARTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Joe Davis
Director, Title I
1427 Buena Vista Avenue
Duarte, California 91010

GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Leroy Morton, Principal
Excelsior School
10421 Woodbury
Garden Grove, California

Hill School
Robert P. Gresham, Principal
9681 Eleventh Street
Garden Grove, California 92640

LITTLE LAKE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Earla Snow
Consultant for the Deaf
9400 Jersey Avenue
Santa Fe Springs, California
(213) 868-8241 Ext 87

LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Rose Engel, Principal
Salvin Elementary School
1925 Budlong Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90007
(213) 731-0703

MODESTO CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
Jerrold Frye
426 Locust Street
Modesto, California 95351

MONTESSORI ACADEMY-Mt. Heli
Barbara Hamilton, Secretary
3327 Kenora Drive
Spring Valley, California 92077
(714) 461-6200

OCEAN VIEW SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Rose Ludwig, Principal
Lark View TMR Facility
7972 Warner Avenue
Huntington,Beach, California 92647
(714) 847-2551

ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR READING COUNCIL
Mrs. Hazel Wilson
Lee High School
(714) 624-5697

ADDRESSES OF CONTACT PERSONS (CONT'D)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ORANGE CENTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
George Nagel, Dist. Superintendent
Orange Center School
3530 S. Cherry
Fresno, California

RIVERSIDE COUNTY SCHOOLS
Mrs. Eleanor Dunn
Title III Director, PROLEXIA
Riverside County Schools Office
P.O. Box 868
Riverside, California 92502
(714) 787-2585

SANTEE SCHOOL DISTRICT
Russ James
Rio Seco School
Santee, California 92071

VICTOR SCHOOL DISTRICT
Mrs. Beth Hill, Curriculum Coordinator
16821 "A" Street
Victorville, California 92392
(714) 245-3263

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
Rhonda Mahan
Lang. Dev. Specialist-Title VI Preschool
Westminster, California

LA VERNE COLLEGE
John Mainiero
Asst. Professor of Education
Department of Education
La Verne, California 91750

SAN FRANCISCO ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS
Beverly Rongren - Docent Coordinator
Zoo Road and Skyline Blvd
San Francisco, California 94132

SAN MATEO COYOTE POINT JUNIOR MUSEUM
Maryann Danielson, Chief
Interpretive Division
Coyote Point
San Mateo, California 94401
(415) 573-2595

LION COUNTRY SAFARI
Brenda Easley - Education
Laguna Hills, California 92653

SAN DIEGO HUMANE SOCIETY
Judy Immenschuh
887 Sherman
San Diego, California
(714) 278-7004

ANACONDA CITY SCHOOLS
Mrs. Madalen Burt
Special Education
1200 West 3rd
Anaconda, Montana 59711

LARUE D. CARTER MEMORIAL HOSPITAL
Mrs. Susan Cooper
Recreational Therapist
Children's Service
1315 West 10th Street
Indianapolis, Indiana 46202

NEW YORK ZOOLOGICAL SOCIETY
Mr. Donald Fine - Education Dept.
Mr. Robert A. Brown - Assoc. Curator
for Early Childhood Education
New York Zoological Society
Bronx, New York 10460

TARONGA ZOO
Barry G. Foy
Acting Senior Education Officer
P.O. Box 20 Mosman NSW 2088
Australia